



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/892,663

06/28/2001

Steven G. Smith

BS00-354

2039

45695

7590

11/14/2006

WITHERS & KEYS FOR BELL SOUTH

P. O. BOX 71355

MARIETTA, GA 30007-1355

EXAMINER

CHANKONG, DOHM

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2152

DATE MAILED: 11/14/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/892,663

Applicant(s)

SMITH ET AL.

Examiner

Dohm Chankong

Art Unit

2152

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 August 2006.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 and 19-21 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 8-16 and 19-21 is/are rejected.
7) ☒ Claim(s) 7 is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5/30/06, 9/18/06
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1> This action is in response to Applicant's amendment and arguments filed 8.24.2006.

Claims 1-16 and 19-21 are presented for further examination.

2> This is a final rejection.

Allowable Subject Matter

3> Claim 7 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

I. APPLICANT'S AMENDMENT DOES NOT OVERCOME THE CITED REFERENCES.

Applicant's amendment do not distinguish the claimed invention over the prior art references. Applicant's amendment primarily introduces two new features into the claimed invention: (A) the first server for managing protocol is in direct communication with the intranet; and (B) that access is granted to the intranet by comparing at the second server, a user ID with a list of authorized intranet users. Applicant's arguments are not persuasive because the prior art references teach these claimed features.

A. Fortier teaches a first server in direct communication with an intranet.

Applicant cites Figure 2 as support for the feature whereby a first server is in direct communication with an intranet. Applicant's specification does not specifically describe that

Art Unit: 2152

the first server is directly connected to the intranet. Therefore, the Office interprets the amended limitation in light of Applicant's figure 2. Fortier discloses an analogous system whereby a first server is in direct communications with an intranet [Figure 1 displaying the router directly connected to an intranet]. Fortier's router is analogous to the claimed first server. Fortier discloses connecting a factory network to both a legacy system (through a transaction server) and a corporate intranet (through the router) thereby providing concurrent access to both systems [Figure 1 | 0015]. Fortier discloses the amended claimed limitation.

- B. Willis and Devine disclose the feature of determining whether to grant access to the intranet by comparing, at the second server, a user ID used to logon to the first server to a list of authorized users.

Contrary to Applicant's assertions, Willis discloses the claimed limitation of determining whether to grant access to the intranet by comparing, at the second server, a user ID used to logon to the first server to a list of authorized users. Specifically, Willis discloses that the transaction servers "maintain user profiles having access authorization" [column 13 «lines 24-25»]. Willis further discloses that the server "verifies users' logon status", the authentication performed by accessing the "user profile information" [column 12 «lines 36-43»]. Therefore, Willis discloses the amended claimed limitation.

Similarly, Devine discloses a requestor must be authorized to communicate with its target service [column 9 «lines 20-23»]. In fact, Devine reserves an entire section for discussing user identification and authorization. Devine discloses retrieving "user's entitlements" where the entitlements "represent specific services the user...has privilege to access" [column 16 «lines 49-50»]. This functionality is achieved in part by validating a

Art Unit: 2152

userid [column 18 «lines 15-37»]. Therefore, Devine discloses the amended claimed limitation.

II. CONCLUSION

The rejection of claims 1-3, 5-18, 22 under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Willis, in view of Breneman et al, U.S Patent No. 5,974,135 [“Breneman”], in view of Devine are withdrawn in view of Applicant’s amendments. However, based on the foregoing remarks, the rejection of claims 1-3, 5-18, 22 under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Willis, Jr. et al, U.S Patent No. 6,738,815 [“Willis”], in view of Profit, Jr. et al, U.S Patent No. 6,636,831 [“Profit”], in further view of Devine et al, U.S Patent No. 6,598,167 [“Devine”], in further view of Fortier, Jr. et al, U.S Patent Publication No. 2003/0023601 [“Fortier”] are maintained. The rejection of claim 4 under 35 U.S.C § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Willis, Profit and Devine, in view of Butts et al, U.S Patent No. 6,233,541 [“Butts”] and claims 19-21 under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Devine, in view of Profit, in further view of Willis and Fortier are also maintained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2152

4> The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action, see final rejection filed 12.19.2005 and non-final rejection filed 5.24.2006. Only those claims that have been amended are formally addressed in this action, see response to arguments above, and rejections that follow.

5> Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 8-18, 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Willis, Jr. et al, U.S Patent No. 6,738,815 ["Willis"], in view of Profit, Jr. et al, U.S Patent No. 6,636,831 ["Profit"], in further view of Devine et al, U.S Patent No. 6,598,167 ["Devine"], in further view of Fortier, Jr. et al, U.S Patent Publication No. 2003|0023601 ["Fortier"].

6> As to claims 1, 9, 14 and 22, Willis discloses a system for permitting a user to access data on a legacy system and an intranet [abstract], comprising:

a systems interface coupled to the legacy systems [column 3 <lines 17-33> | column 5 <lines 18-36>],

wherein the systems interface comprises at least one network address that can be accessed by a computer [column 6 <lines 6-9> | column 8 <lines 3-25>],

wherein the systems interface comprises a first server for managing protocol regarding the computer interfacing with a second server for generating transactions regarding the legacy systems [column 3 <lines 25-33> | column 8 <lines 51-67> : a technician may only communicate with the system when logged in during a session].

Willis discloses that the systems interface is adapted to route communications from the computer from the at least one network address to a separate network address

Art Unit: 2152

corresponding to an intranet that is distinct from the legacy system [column 6 «lines 1-5» | column 14 «line 19» | claims 3 and 7 where: as Willis also discloses that his system could be utilized to access intranets, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement one of Willis' non-legacy systems as an intranet to allow the technicians more options from which to access their information]. In addition, Willis discloses the systems interface determines whether to grant access to the intranet by comparing, at the second server, a user ID used to logon to the first server to a list of authorized intranet users [column 12 «lines 36-43» | column 13 «lines 24-25»].

However, Willis does not explicitly disclose routing of communications upon detecting that the user has launched a browser on the computer nor does he disclose the first server for managing protocol bypassing the second server by directing the communication from the computer directly to the intranet.

Willis also does not expressly disclose the computer in communication with both the at least one network address and the separate network address such that communication is maintained concurrently. However, Willis does disclose a system that is enabled to route messages to both legacy systems as well as non-legacy systems [claims 1, 7], suggesting that the computer is maintaining concurrent connections with both systems. Furthermore, Fortier discloses a workstation enabled to concurrently communicate with separate legacy systems and an intranet and that the first server is in direct communication with the intranet [Figure 1 : see response to arguments above]. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, based on Willis' functionality and Fortier's teachings, to have reasonably inferred

Art Unit: 2152

Willis' computer to be concurrently connected to both legacy and non-legacy systems (as they are separate systems on the network, they have separate network addresses as well).

7> Devine teaches routing communications upon detecting that a user has launched a browser on the computer [column 12 <lines 28-47> | column 13 <line 62> to column 14 <line 7>]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate Devine's browser detection capability into Willis to provide handshaking functionality between Willis' client and server systems, increasing the security of the communications.

8> In the same field of invention, Profit is directed towards enabling a mobile worker to remotely access corporate data located in legacy systems [column 2 «lines 43-52»]. Additionally, Profit discloses both a first server for managing protocol and a second server, whereby the first server bypasses the second server by directing communications from the computer directly to an intranet [column 6 «lines 32-51» where : Profit's server suite 24, is analogous to the first server, and the middleware 22, is analogous to the second server that is directly connected to the legacy systems]. Profit discloses that the server suite in addition to working with the middleware to access legacy applications, can also "provide the functionality of a Web server for providing content over an Internet or intranet (not shown), "Web" is a shorthand for Worldwide web and is commonly used to refer to scripted documents exchanged over the Internet or an intranet". Therefore, when the client needs to access documents from an intranet source and not the legacy system, Profit's server suite

Art Unit: 2152

directly handles these requests and accesses the data from the intranet. There is no need to go through the middleware because the middleware seems to be used for “converting legacy information received from the business applications or the ERP system”. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate Profit’s server suite functionality into Willis’ mobile access system to enable users to access data from separate intranet and legacy systems.

9> Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Willis, Profit and Devine, in view of Butts et al, U.S Patent No. 6,233,541 [“Butts”].

10> Claims 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Devine, in view of Profit, in further view of Willis and Fortier.

11> As to claim 19, Devine discloses a method for permitting a user to access data [column 2 <lines 55-60>], comprising:

authenticating a computer attempting to log onto a systems interface to legacy systems [column 8 <lines 31-34>];

providing initial and persistent access to the systems interface, the systems interface corresponding to at least one network address and including a protocol server providing an interface to a transaction server that is in direct communication with the legacy system

[Figure 1 <items 17,24> | column 3 <lines 54-57> | column 13 <lines 29-35> | column 13 <line 62> to

Art Unit: 2152

column 14 <line 7> where: Devine's DMZ is comparable to the systems interface. User has access throughout his session];

detecting an attempt to access the intranet, wherein the intranet is distinct from the legacy systems, wherein the attempt comprises a user launching a browser [Figure 1 <items 14,30> | column 12 <lines 28-32>];

determining whether to deny the computer access to the intranet by comparing, at the transaction server, a user ID used to logon to the protocol server to a list of prohibited users [column 12 <lines 35-37> | column 13 <lines 62-63> | column 18 <lines 15-37>] where: the server attempts to authenticate the client. While Devine does not expressly disclose the list of prohibited users, such a feature is obvious in view of Devine's disclosure of determining whether the user ID is valid]; and

directing communications from the computer from the systems interface to a separate network address corresponding to the intranet [Figures <1,5> | column 9 <lines 20-37> | column 13 <lines 39-40> where: the TCP/IP in the message format references a network address for the intranet].

Devine does not disclose the directing the an intranet by the protocol server bypassing the transaction server by direct communications from the computer directly to an intranet nor does he disclose the computer in communication with both the at least one network address and the separate network address such that communication is maintained concurrently.

12> Profit discloses both a protocol server and a transaction server, whereby the protocol server bypasses the transaction server by directing communications from the computer directly to an intranet [column 6 «lines 32-51» where : Profit's server suite 24, is analogous to a protocol server, and the middleware 22, is analogous to a transaction server that is directly connected to the legacy systems]. Profit discloses that the server suite in addition to working with the middleware to access legacy applications, can also "provide the functionality of a Web server for providing content over an Internet or intranet (not shown), "Web" is a shorthand for Worldwide web and is commonly used to refer to scripted documents exchanged over the Internet or an intranet". Therefore, when the client needs to access documents from the intranet, Profit's server suite directly handles requests to the intranet, with no need to go through the middleware because the middleware seems to be used for "converting legacy information received from the business applications or the ERP system". It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement Profit's server functionality into Devine to enable a user to access data from both a legacy and intranet source [To avoid confusion, it should be noted that Examiner is not referring to the intranet that Devine utilizes to access his legacy system; the intranet used in the rejection of this claim is provided by Profit. In other words Devine discloses an invention to access a legacy system (through an intranet). Profit discloses accessing a legacy system and a separate intranet. It is this functionality that is combined with Devine in the rejection of this claim].

13> Willis does disclose a system that is enabled to route messages to both legacy systems as well as non-legacy systems [claims 1, 7], suggesting that the computer is maintaining

Art Unit: 2152

concurrent connections with both systems. Furthermore, Fortier discloses a workstation enabled to concurrently communicate with separate legacy systems and an intranet wherein the protocol server is in direct communication with the intranet [Figure 1]. Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, based on Willis' functionality and Fortier's teachings, to modify Devine's system such that a computer may access a legacy and non-legacy system concurrently. Such a combination would enable a user to access both legacy and intranet systems remotely [see Willis, column 3 «lines 6-12»].

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dohm Chankong whose telephone number is 571.272.3942.


The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday-Friday [7:30 AM to 4:30 PM].

Art Unit: 2152

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit can be reached on 571.272.3913. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

DC



BUNJOB JAROENCHONWANIT
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER